

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's Action of September 8, 2004, has been received and reviewed by counsel for Assignee. In that Action the Examiner objected to the drawings and specification because of an inconsistency related to Figure 13B. Claims 1-4, 9, 10 and 13 were rejected, and claims 5-8, 11 and 12 were objected to. By this response counsel has amended the specification and submits amended and additional claims for examination. This response is believed to place all claims in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed next.

The Examiner objected to the drawings and specification because of an inconsistency with respect to Figure 13B. Figure 13B itself is correct, and by this response counsel has amended the specification to reflect Figure 13B as it was originally filed. This amendment adds no new matter; it interchanges the explanation of the X and Y axes of Figure 13B.

In the Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Leser* in U.S. Patent 4,459,487, and rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of two enumerated references. The Examiner also indicated that claims 5-8, 11 and 12 were objected to and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response counsel has done so. In particular, claim 5 has been canceled and its limitations introduced into claim 1. Because claim 5 depended only from claim 1, claim 1 should now be allowable over the cited reference. Claims 2, 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, and should be allowable, at least for that reason. A minor typographical error was corrected in claim 4.

Claim 6 was also indicated as being allowable if it were amended to incorporate the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. Claim 6 previously depended only from claim 1. By this response all of the limitations of claim 1 have been incorporated into amended claim 6. Counsel believes this amendment will make claim 6 allowable. Claims 7 and 8 depended directly or indirectly from claim 6, and these two claims should be allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 11 was previously found to have allowable subject matter. Accordingly, its limitations have been introduced into parent claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is now believed to be allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 10 rather than from claim 11, which has now been canceled. Claim 12 is believed allowable, at least because of its dependence from claim 10.

Claim 13 was rejected. It has been amended to correspond to the combinations of claims 1 and 6. Because claim 6 depended from claim 1 and was found to have allowable subject matter, claim 13 is believed allowable for the same reasons.

New claims 14-20 are also submitted with this response. Those claims correspond to pending claims 1-4 and 6-8, but rewritten in non-means-plus-function format. These claims are submitted to enable to have Applicants to have the full benefit of their invention in both means-plus-function and non-means-plus-function formats.

Accordingly, all claims now presented for examination are believed allowable over the cited references. Objections to the specification and drawings are also believed overcome. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is believed appropriate.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Colwell
Reg. No. 27,431

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCC:mks
60393342 v1